Confidential.

P.

Collection No. 36.

VOL. II.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Council Section.

CB 132 - 19 of 1923.

SUBJECT.

B. January 1920

Conveying the displeasure of Govt. to Mr. V. T. Gopala Iyengar, Dt: Judge Bangalore, for having travelled in 3rd Cl: & drawn 1st Class travelling allowance for certain journeys.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.

LATER REFERENCES.

WD189—GPB—500—25-8-19

15/1/20.

G. R. S. III—1] 191 9. - 20

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(C B)

NOTES

File No. 132.

FILE HEADING.

Conduct of Sri M. T. Gopalacharyar Dt: Judge Bangalore for having travelled in the 3rd Class Express First Class Travelling Off

From

No.	Dated	Received

Diary No.	Enclos.	Spare Copies.	Serial No.

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

NOTES—First Sheet.

D.41
967
CB 132-19

Efficiency Audit Branch.

ABSTRACT OF NEWSPAPER INTELLIGENCE.

Date 10th July 1919

No.	Subject of article	Name of newspaper, date and page	Remarks
1	Inefficiency of the Efficiency Dept.	The TRUTH Dated 7-7-1919 Page 1	States that the Efficiency Department has not taken any action in the matter of the District Judge of Bangalore travelling in 3rd class to Kolar to hold the sessions but claiming double first-class fare for the journey.
2	A matter for immediate enquiry	-do- Page 2	States that the Forest Department has not accepted the lowest tender for the supply of fuel to Bangalore City and that the Authorities seem to be interested in the man whose tender has been accepted.
3	Why not sack him	-do-	States that one Rajiengar is found to be responsible for the Railway accident at Jala and that the public should be informed of the punishment meted out to him
4	If unfit for Amildari, promote him as Assistant Commissioner	-do-	Refers to the appointment of Mr.P.S.Purnaiya as District Economic Superintendent and states that it is a case in which a person who is found unfit as Amildar has been promoted as Assistant Commissioner.
5	Why waste tax-payers' money	-do-	States that there is no need for two separate departments of Carriage and Wagon and the Loco in the Mysore Railways and that their separate existence is a waste of public money.
6	Kolar Sub Division Court	The Karnataka Dated 9-7-19 Page 2	A Correspondent refers to certain irregularities in the Sub Division Court. Also states that a ryot has been sentenced to 6 months' rigorous imprisonment for assaulting the Amildar of Bowringpet when he was commandeering ragi and that the evidence in the case required to be sifted properly.
7	Tumkur Notes	-do- Page 5	A Correspondent refers to the eccentric behaviour of the Amildar Magistrate, Kunigal, towards the local advocates and that his procedure of recording evidence is open to question

The Retd. Chief Court Judges write a reply that the Circuit arrangements were discussed & approved by Govt.

165
11.7.19

FIRST MEMBER)

SMM
10-7-19

Vide reply - 12-7-19

2/ To the Chief Secretary for further action

12-7

General and Revenue Secretariat.

C B File No. 182 of 1919

Serial No.	
1	To The Registrar Chief Court D.O.C. 1895 D/ 25-7-1919 Request him to ascertain & report the truth or otherwise of the fact contained in the article entitled The "Inefficiency of the Effete Dept" appearing in the "Truth" of the 7th inst. per the Dt: Judge Bangalore enclosing 1st C.C. Ag: fare Slip travelling in the III Cl. from Bangalore to Kolar & back & the Revenue
2	From the above. D.O 26 D/ 8-8-1919. Fwd: the explanation in original of Mr C.V.J. Gopala Iyengar Dt: Judge, Bangalore, in the matter
3	To. the above. Ctr. 967 D/ 8th January 1920. and consideration of his Gopala Iyengar's explanation & of the observation of the Chief Court thereon, &c, Govt desire with to take any further action in the matter in view of the fact of his retirement should & Content themselves with the observation that their displeasure should be communicated to him Govt

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

3) Entd. with a D. O to the Regr. chief court.

4) Issued

18.7.19

D.O No 25 S & C-a dated the Regr Chief Court forwarding the explanation in original

Sent with regd

5) as ordered (Kielo Regr D.O.C.S 8.8.19) D. M. 12/8

6) Chief sect

7) In perusal

2nd member

Dewan

D. M. 16/8

8) The Financial Secretary may be consulted as to the legality of the claim & the form of the Agreement which he will draw up.

16/8

To Secty. with Compliments

15/8 D. M.

Sus A 289/111

PROTECTION BRANCH. 4 AUG 1919

N.B Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | C B File No. 131 of 1919.

Serial No.

9) Altogether Mr. Gopalaiengar mentions eight journeys for which he drew double the fare for first class without however travelling in that class. He also refers to some other journeys made in second class with his friends. As regards six of the journeys performed with his family his letter does not state how many members of it accompanied him. In respect of two journeys, however, made on the 23rd and 26th June 1919 he gives details of the party that accompanied him and it consisted of 3 ladies, 2 children and 1 servant. The expense to which he was put for each of these journeys was therefore the price of 6 third class tickets which is equivalent to the value of one first class ticket. An officer who does not travel first class but claims double first class fare has to furnish the following certificate

"I certify that I paid not less than the amount herein charged in railway-fares for myself, my family, my servants and my personal baggage."

On his own shewing, Mr. Gopalaiengar paid only the price of one first class ticket but certified that he had paid the price of two. So far as these two journeys are concerned the certificate did not represent facts and the claim resting on it was untenable.

10) Mr. Gopalaiengar has sent copies of six bills

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-3-18—S.

(4)

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | C B File No. 132 of 1919.

Serial No.

bills and I invite reference to the form of the alternative certificate given in two of these, -- namely those for May and June 1919. The certificate runs as follows:-

"I also certify that I travelled on this railway journey ~~and~~ by the first class. I further certify that I paid not less than the amount here in charged in railway fares for myself, my family, my servants and my personal baggage."

This certificate may be compared with those in the other four bills. In the latter he has scored out the words "by the first class" while in the other two bills he has allowed these words to stand and certified that besides travelling first class he incurred charges equal to ~~the~~ two first class ~~fare~~ fares claimed and taken by him.

H. In his present letter he states that the following journeys ~~are~~ were made in the classes noted against the items:-

Date.	From.	To,	Class.
1. 2nd May 1919.	Kolar	Bangalore	Third - States that he held a 2nd class ticket but performed the journey partly in the 3rd and partly in the 2nd class.
2. 23rd June 1919	Bangalore	Kolar	Third.
3. 26th June 1919	Kolar	Bangalore	Third.

~~For~~ In the bills in which he has claimed travelling allowance for the above journeys, he has, as pointed

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20-3-18—S.

Serial No.

pointed out above, certified that he travelled first class. The certificates in the bills for May and June 1919 are therefore untrue. That the retention on the certificates of these bills of the words 'by the first class' was not due to any oversight, is evident from the word 'further' in the addition to the certificates made by him.

13) The claims for double first class fare for the journeys stated by Mr. Gopalaiengar to have been performed in 2nd class with his friends were also untenable as the rules do not allow an officer to take his friends at Government expense. What were the dates of these journeys, he does not state and without reference to the bills concerned, it is not possible to say what was exactly the certificate given by him. Apparently it was the usual alternative certificate reproduced above. If so, Mr. Gopalaiengar should not have certified that he had incurred charges for the railway fare of the members of his family when those that accompanied him were only his friends.

Mull 21.8.19

14) 2nd member

15) 21/8/19.

16) Secretary

(WD) A-1769—GPB—60,000—20-3-18—S.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

C B File No. 132 of 1919.

Serial No.

17) The opinion of Hon'ble C.J. may be called for in the light of the H. Law's opinion

25.8.19

18) Forwarded with Compliments the papers to the Registrar of the Chief Court for the opinion of the Chief Court being kindly furnished in the light of the Finance Secy's remarks.

C Balasundaramayya

27/8/19

Chief Court of Mysore,

Bangalore, the 14th October 1919.

1. 19) There has been some delay in the disposal of this unofficial reference, owing to the fact that, in order to enable the Judges to express an opinion, Mr. Gopaliengar's explanation had to be obtained on certain points raised in the Financial Secretary's note. A copy of the explanation received (dated 23rd September 1919) is appended.

2. 20) As far as the Judges can make out, there are only three main points upon which any question arises.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

The

Serial No.

(3) The first is as to why Mr.Gopaliengar certified on his T.A.bill, with reference to the journeys made on the 23rd and 26th June 1919, that he had paid the price of two first class tickets, when as a matter of fact he had only purchased six third class tickets, which were equal in value to one first class ticket.

(4) Mr.Gopaliengar's explanation is that he was under the impression that, if he incurred expenses equal to one first class fare, he would be entitled to double first class fare as a matter of course, just as an officer buying one first class ticket would get the price of two without incurring any further expense.

(5) This is no doubt a mistake, but there is no reason to suppose that it was more than a mistake, or that Mr.Gopaliengar purposely recorded a certificate that was false to his knowledge. The fact that the information about the purchase of six third class tickets has been furnished of his own accord goes far to negative such a supposition. The certificate required of an officer in such circumstances is that he paid "not less than the amount herein charged" in railway fares and personal baggage; and it is possible that there may be a bona-fide impression among some officers that the phrase "amount charged" is nothing more than the

(6)

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

actual

Serial No.

"actual fare by rail" which is required to be entered in one of the columns of the T.A.bill. If this be so, it may be desirable to make the rules and the form of certificate clearer.

3. The next point has reference to the observation of the Financial Secretary that the certificates in the bills for May and June 1919 that the journey was made by first class must be"untrue". That observation rests partly upon the fact, - admitted by Mr.Gopaliengar, and indeed volunteered by himself in his letter of 31st July 1919, - that certain journeys made by him in the months of May and June 1919 were by third class; and partly upon the presence simultaneously upon the bills in question of a double certificate as to the class travelled by and the amount incurred in railway fares.

Mr. Gopaliengar explains that he performed several journeys in the months of May and June; that the first certificate as to class of journey was retained because he did travel to Tumkur by the first class in both those months, and that the second certificate was added because he had travelled on other occasions either by the second or the third class. In other words, these were separate certificates applicable to separate journeys, and as such were not untrue.

In so far as the explanation bears upon the facts

facts concerned, the Judges consider that Mr.Gopaliengar's statement must be accepted as true, at any rate as long as it is not alleged and proved that no other journeys were performed in May amd June than those admitted to have been done in a lower class than the first, or that the District Judge's intention was to apply the double certificate to one and the same journey or journeys. Accepting, then, his statement of the facts as true, it follows that the charge of making a deliberately "untrue" certificate cannot be sustained. The Government will no doubt agree that a very serious charge of this nature ought not to be lightly made against an officer occupying the position of a District Judge until all other hypotheses have been fairly considered and rejected.

Having said so much, the Judges would proceed to add that the correct course for Mr.Gopaliengar to have adopted was to confine each of the two forms of certificate, to the particular journey or journeys to which alone it had a reference, instead of employing a mixed form of certificate for all the journeys of the month. The presence of the double certificate on the bills for May and June ought perhaps to have put the Audit Office on enquiry as to particulars of the several journeys undertaken before passing the bills; but without more informa-

tion

G. R. S. III-2.

General and Revenue Secretariat. | CB File No. 182 of 1919.

Serial No.

information as to the practice obtaining in that office than the Judges possess, they are of course not in a position to say whether or not the double form was considered to be such an unusual one as to require elucidation.

4. 22) The last point raised is with reference to journeys in the second class made in the company of friends, as to which the Financial Secretary has remarked that "Mr. Gopaliengar should not have certified that he had incurred charges for the railway fare of the members of his family when those that accompanied him were only his friends".

Mr. Gopaliengar's explanation is that his friends did not travel on any business of their own, but merely accompanied him for the sake of company and at his request; "as such," he says, "I believed that I could include them among my party".

That he must have acted under some such belief seems fairly obvious; otherwise he would not have volunteered the information that he had taken his friends at his expense and travelled with them in the second class. In the absence of particulars as to the journeys referred to and of the T.A. bills relating to them, it is not possible (as observed by the Financial Secretary) to say what was exactly the certificate given. But Mr. Gopaliengar does not deny the assuption made that "apparently it was the

NOTE—Contn. sheet

usual

C.45 CB132/19

usual alternative certificate"; and in any case his explanation implies that the railway fare paid on behalf of his friends was included in the amount charged to Government on account of railway fares for "self, family and servants". The Judges agree with the Financial Secretary's view that he was not entitled to do this, and that an officer's friends do not come under the designation of "members of his family" for purposes of travelling allowance.

23) 5. In conclusion, as the case seems to point only to a misconception of the rules, and not to their deliberate evasion, the Judges do not think any particular action is called for, beyond perhaps a direction (if Government sees fit) to refund such amount of travelling allowance as may be found to have been drawn in excess in respect of specific journeys made by Mr.Gopaliengar.

" By Order "

REGISTRAR.

24/ Subd to Dewan with regd to this note
dy 25/8/19.

25/ may be circulated for consideration at an early meeting of Council

26/ CS. Circulate

21.10.19

Enclosure to the Chief Court's Order in the Mss

SUBMITTED:

27)

For favour of consideration.

Adverting to your personal enquiry regarding journeys performed by me on duty to Kolar and Tumkur during the months of May and June last and the travelling allowance bills tendered by me for those months I submit the following explanation.

(1). Re journeys on the 23rd and 26th June 1919 you were pleased to ask me why I certified that I paid the price of two first class tickets when I actually bought six third class tickets equalling the value of one first class ticket only.

I was under the impression that if I incurred expenses equal to one first class fare I would be entitled to double first class fare as a matter of course just as an officer buying one first class ticket would get the price of two without incurring any further expense. I had no occasion to study the T.A. rules critically as hitherto I was only a stationary officer.

(2). Journey in second class on the 23rd June and in the third class on the 26th June. 'Double certificate'. Certificate of travelling by the first class is untrue.

I submit from a reference to my T.A. bills you will find that I have performed several journeys in the months of May and June. The first certificate that I travelled by the first class was retained because I did travel to Tumkur by the first class in both May and June. The second certificate was added because I had travelled on other occasions either by the second class or third class. I therefore submit that the double certificate does not refer to my Kolar trip on the 23rd and 26th June and is not untrue.

(3)

(3). Journeys by the second class with friends.

I paid the railway fare for my friends. They had no business of their own. They accompanied me for the sake of my company and at my request. As such I believed that I could include them among my party. It did not occur to me that I should interpretthe certificate literally.

I submit that I had absolutely no intention to make false certificates and profit myself by a few rupees at the expense of the Government. I had not studied the T.A. rules carefully and discovered my mistake only when you were pleased to draw my attention to the language of the alternative certificate. I believe I have satisfied you that my mistake, for which I regret very much, was bona-fide and not due to any fraudulent intention. Having served the Government most faithfully for over 25 years I could not be so indiscreet as to think of making false certificates for the sake of a few rupees just when my service is coming to a close.

(Sd.) N.T. Gopaliengar,

23rd Sept.1919. District Judge.

To

The Chief Judge,

Chief Court of Mysore,

Bangalore.

" COPY "

an early
(For Disposal at a Meeting)

No. C. 215

.....1919.-20

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Council Matter.

SUBJECT.

(Under clause v of the schedule.)

Notice to be taken of the conduct of Mr. N.T.Gopaliengar, District and Sessions Judge, Bangalore, in having made certain journeys by railway in the 3rd class and drawn double first fare for them on his travelling allowance bills.

CIRCULATED TO THE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.

By Order,

C S Balasundaramayya
Chief Secretary to Government.

.....23rd.....October.....1919.

Extraordinary Member of Council.

2925-58
3-11-19

First Member of Council. Seen Dead 4-11-19.

Second Member of Council. 30/10/19

Third Member of Council. 1/11

C.215 C&132/19 (12

Extract from the Proceedings of the 511th *Meeting of the Council of His Highness the Maharaja, held at Bangalore on the* 13th November 1919.

5. Subject. - Clause v of the schedule.

Notice to be taken of the conduct of Mr. N. T. Gopaliengar, District and Sessions Judge, Bangalore, in having made certain journeys by railway in the third class and drawn double first class fare for them on his travelling allowance bills.

Opinion of the Council.

32) The displeasure of Government may be communicated to Mr. Gopaliengar. No further action is necessary as Mr. Golapliengar is to retire in March next.

(Signed) M. Kantaraj Urs,
Dewan of Mysore.

"EXTRACT"

C S Balasundaram

Chief Secretary to Government.

WD 1148—GPB—1,000—23-12-18

C. 215

1st

General and Revenue Secretariat.

C 13 File No. of 191 .

Serial No.	
	33) D. F. N. Submd.
	20/11/19 34) 2nd member
	35) DFR revised & appd 22/11/19
	24/11/19
2563 24-11-19	36) Final Note signed by the member is put up
	24/11/19.
	37) D. S. N. Submitted
	Dewan
	25/11/19

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

CB 132/19

(14

Final Note by the Second Member of Council.

Subject:- Notice to be taken of the conduct of Mr. N. T. Gopaliengar, District Judge, Bangalore, for having travelled in the third class and drawn first class travelling allowance for certain journeys.

---

38) In the issue of the newspaper "Truth" dated the 7th July 1919 mention was made of the fact that the District Judge of Bangalore had travelled in the third class to Kolar to hold the Sessions and claimed first class travelling allowances for the journey.

39) 2. At the instance of the then First Member of Council, Mr. K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar, the Registrar of the Chief Court was requested to ascertain the truth or otherwise of the allegation.

40) 3. Mr. Gopaliengar in his letter dated 31st July 1919 to the Chief Court has made the following statements:-

(1) He travelled in third class on certain occasions.

(2) He took his family members and servants with him on those occasions.

(3) He also took his friends at his own expense and on all such occasions he travelled with them in the second class.

(4) He travelled in a lower class not with the idea of gaining money but for the sake of keeping company with his family members and friends.

41) 4. The papers were forwarded to the Financial Secretary and his remarks are summarised below:-

(1) In respect of two journeys made on the 23rd and 26th June 1919 the certificate made by Mr. Gopaliengar did not represent facts and the claim for travelling allowance resting on them is untenable;

(19

(2) in respect of the journeys made by him on the 2nd May and the 23rd and 26th June 1919 when he travelled either in the 2nd or 3rd class, the certificate made by him that he travelled in the first class is untrue;

and (3) the claim for double first class fare for the journeys said to have been performed by Mr.Gopaliengar with his friends is untenable. He should not have certified that he incurred charges for the railway fare of the members of his family while those that accompanied him were only his friends.

42) 5. The file was then sent unofficiaply to the Judges of the Chief Court who having obtained the further explanation of Mr.Gopaliengar on the three points raised by the Financial Secretary observe that Mr. Gopaliengar has no doubt committed some mistake in regard to the furnishing of the certificates in his travelling allowance bills and that he should not have claimed first class fare in consideration of his having paid the railway fare of his friends that accompanied him in his tour. They, however, consider that the case seems to point only to a misconception of the rules and not to their deliberate evasion and that no particular action is called for beyond perhaps a direction to refund such amount of the travelling allowance as may be found to have been drawn in excess in respect of specific journeys made by Mr.Gopaliengar.

E

Pages 6-11 of the notes.

43) 6. The subject was considered at a meeting of Council held on the 13th November 1919 and the Council have resolved that the displeasure of Government may be communicated to Mr. Gopaliengar and that no further action is necessary as he is to retire in March next.

Page 12 of the notes.

44) 7. The recommendation of the Council may be approved.

MEMBER OF COUNCIL.

24th November 1919.

CB 132/19

Submitted to His Highness.

45

I submit herewith a Final Note by the...Second.....

Member of Council on the subject: ~~of~~ viz.,...notice to be taken of the conduct of Mr.N.T.Gopaliengar,District Judge, Bangalore,for having travelled in the third class and drawn first-class travelling allowance for certain journeys,

for His Highness' gracious approval.

26th Nov.1919

Dewan.

CB 132/19

Record of Cases submitted for the Orders of His Highness the Maharaja

Subject.

Proposal to convey the displeasure of Government to Mr.N.T.Gopaliengar, District Judge, Bangalore, for having travelled in third class and drawn first class travelling allowance for certain journeys.

625

46) *Order.*

~~KRW~~

30/11/19

47) Ch-Leg

3.12.19

G. R. S. III-2]

C. 215

19

General and Revenue Secretariat.

CB File No. 132 of 191 9.

Serial No.

(*)

31. All urgent or confidential files returned with His Highness' orders may, in the absence of instructions or indications to the contrary, be ordinarily circulated to the Members of Council for perusal after the issue of orders.

33. The Secretaries concerned should see that orders in the cases referred to above are issued at once and that the files are returned immediately after to the Chief Secretary for circulation to the Members.

34. In all other cases, the files will first be circulated to the Members of Council at headquarters and then sent to the Secretariat concerned for the issue of orders.

48/ Circulated to the Members of Council for perusal of (*) His Highness' orders before ~~after~~ issue of orders. (*Vide* Rules 31, 33 and 34 of the Subsidiary Rules for the conduct of business of Council in the Manual of Council Rules and Procedure).

CS Balasundaram 7/12/19
Chief Secretary to Govt.

Through the Secretary to Government,

....Department.

3737-185
9-12-19

49/ FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL Hon Peel 10.12.19

2777
9.12.19

50/ SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL Dr. Murphy 10/12

51/ TEMPORARY MEMBER OF COUNCIL. 10/12

52/ Dr. Smith.
Hon
19/12/19 5-3 12 no members
Dr. Murphy 19/12/19
10/12

NOTE.—Contn. sheet

WD 1573—GPB—500—4-3-19

G. R. S. VI—G/32] 1817

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

( )

, *the* 191

Date of issue 25/7/17

Signed by .....

Section 6(1)c 3

File No. 132-19

Serial No. 1.

No. 11895

To

Dear Sir,

I am desired to request you to ascertain and report about the truth or otherwise of the insinuations contained in the article entitled the inefficiency of the Efficiency Dept." appearing on page 1 of the issue of the 7th inst alleging that the Dt-

over.

(24

judge ~~[illegible]~~ Bangalore
claimed. First class fare
while travelling in the
3rd Class from Bangalore
to Kolar. ~~to and from~~ to hold the
Sessions ~~work~~ there

An early reply is
requested

Yours sincerely

S N A

To

The Srinivasa Iyer, Esq. B.A., B.L.
Reg. Chief Court

List of enclosures.

17/2/09

Copied by

Examined by

(25

Chief Court.

Bangalore.

8th August 1919.

Dear Sir,

With reference to your D.O.No.G 1895/cts dated 25th July 1919, requesting me to ascertain and report the truth or otherwise of the allegations in the article entitled the 'inefficiency of the Efficien-cy Department' appearing on page 1 of the issue of the 'Truth' of the 7th July, I am desired to forward herewith the explanation in original of Mr.N.T.Gopala Iyengar, District Judge, Bangalore, in the matter.

Yours Sincerely,

C.S.Balasundarm Iyer

Esqr, B.A.

confidential

District Court
Bangalore
31st July 19

Dear Mr Srinivasa Iyer

I am in receipt of your D.O. letter no. 17 of 26th inst.

I had information from my friends that some accusations made against me in the "Truth." Being anxious to see what they were I obtained a copy of the paper of the 7th inst & perused the article referred to by you —

The facts mentioned therein are not entirely true. I do not deny that I travelled in the 3d class on two occasions. On both the occasions I went with the members of my family — On the 2nd

last — when returning from Kolar —
I bought — a second class ticket — with
Sal — in a third class compartment —
with the — members of my family.
At Hindukula a station between
Kolar & Bowringpet a European
woman — came into the compartment
where my family people were —
seated & I left that compart-
-ment — at once & went — into the
second class for which I had
already taken a ticket — at Kolar
no excess fare was collected from
me at any station as there was
no occasion for it —

On the 25th June last — I travelled
with three ladies & two children
to Kolar as they were anxious to
have a bath — at "Antargange"
I bought — 3 class tickets for all
five besides a servant — I returned

with them to Bangalore on the 26th June
& travelled by the same class —

I also submit — for the information of the Judges that — I have travelled to & back in the 3d class with my family members on two occasions. I have also taken my friends at my own expense & on all such occasions I have travelled with them in the second class —

I submit — for the consideration of the Judges that — I travelled in a lower class not with the idea of saving money but — for the sake of the company of my friends and family members — I beg to add that I have often spent — as much

as I earned as T. a. + Batta + sometimes
none — I have never made any false
declarations on the back of my
T. a. Bills, but — have added the correct
certificates as required by art 542
of the Mysore Service Regulations
I have submitted for favour of
perusal by the Judges copies of
my T. a. bills obtained from the
Comptroller — I hope my explan-
ation will be accepted by the
Judges as satisfactory —

I find that — improper motives
are likely to be attributed however
bonafide an officer may act
+ I therefore beg to assure, that
I will hereafter make it a point
to be guided by the first class always

Yours sincerely

R. Gopalaswamy
Offg D.J.

To
S. Srinivasa Iyer
Esq B.A. B.L.
Registrar Chitradurga

(26

Confidential

Dear Sir, R214 Bond 9-6-14 (certificate)

Your D. of the 26th instant.

As desired copies of bills you want are herewith sent.

Yours Sincy
M. A. Rangaben

To

K. T. Gopalaiengar Esqr B.A.L.L.B.
District Judge
Bangalore.

Confidential.

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Order No. 947 (CS 13279-3) Bangalore, dated 8th January 1920 ~~December 1919~~.

In the issue of the newspaper "Truth" dated the 7th July 1919, an allegation was made that the District Judge of Bangalore had travelled by train in the Third Class to Kolar to hold the Sessions and had claimed First Class travelling allowances for the journey. On an enquiry made Mr. Gopaliengar has explained the circumstances relative to the journeys and claims for travelling allowance in question.

2. On a consideration of Mr. Gopaliengar's explanation and of the observations of the Chief Court thereon, Government are of opinion that the certificates furnished by Mr. Gopaliengar in some of his travelling allowance bills were irregular. They consider that an Officer of Mr. Gopaliengar's standing and position should not have travelled in a lower class on Government duty and claimed higher class travelling allowance under a misconception of the rules. Government do not wish to take any further action in the matter in view of the fact that the Officer is to retire shortly and content themselves with a direction that their displeasure should be communicated to Mr. Gopaliengar.

Chief Secretary to Government.

To

The Registrar, Chief Court of Mysore (with a covering letter.)

Confidential.

Proceedings of the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Order No. 947
Cts 132-19-3

Bangalore, dated 8th January 1920

In the issue of the newspaper "Truth" dated the 7th July 1919 an allegation was made ~~of the fact~~ that the District Judge of Bangalore had travelled by rail in the Third Class to Kolar to hold the Sessions and had claimed First class travelling allowances for the journey.

On an enquiry made Mr Gopaliengar has explained the circs relative to the journeys & claims for travelling allce in question -

2. On an enquiry made Mr. N.T. Gopaliengar, the District Judge of Bangalore, made the following statements:--

(1) He travelled in Third class on certain occasions.

(2) He took his family members and servants with him on those occasions.

(3) He also took his friends at his own expense and on all such occasions he travelled with them in the Second class.

(4) He travelled in a lower class not with the idea of gaining money but for the sake of keeping company with his family members and friends.

3. Government however noticed that the certificates made by Mr. Gopaliengar in his travelling allowance bills for journeys made on 2nd May and 23rd and 26th June 1919 did not represent facts. He should not have

certified that he incurred charges for the railway fare of the members of his family while those that accompanied him were only his friends.

4. The Chief Court who were consulted in the matter obtained a further explanation from Mr. Gopaliengar on the points referred to above. The Judges observe that Mr. Gopaliengar has no doubt committed some mistakes in regard to the furnishing of the certificates in his travelling allowance bills and that he should not have claimed first class fare in consideration of his having paid the railway fare of his friends that accompanied him in his tour. They however consider that the case seems to point only to a misconception of the rules and not to their deliberate evasion and that no particular action is called for beyond perhaps a direction to ~~fx xxfxxxxd~~ refund (if Government so direct) such amount of the travelling allowance as may be found to have been drawn in excess in respect of specific journeys made by Mr. Gopaliengar.

On a consideration of Mr Gopaliengar's explanation & of the observations of the Chief Court thereon

~~I~~ We consider that

5. ~~After considering all the circumstances of the case,~~ Government are of opinion that the certificates furnished by Mr. Gopaliengar in some of his travelling allowance bills ~~are quite~~ were irregular. An Officer of Mr. Gopaliengar's standing and position should not have travelled in a lower class on Government duty and claimed higher class travelling allowance under a misconception of the rules. ~~Before making such a claim he should have~~

(80)

satisfied himself beyond doubt that it was admissible under the rules and was otherwise unobjectionable. ~~His conduct in this respect is not satisfactory and Government accordingly direct that their displeasure be communicated to him.~~ ~~They~~ Govt do not wish to take any further action in the matter in view of the fact that the Officer is to retire shortly, resolved themselves with a direction that their displeasure should be communicated to the Appellant.

Chief Secy. to Govt.

To

The Registrar, Chief Court of Mysore.

(with a covering letter).

19/12/45